

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/542,880	KITAYAMA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Yong Chu	1626	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Yong Chu. (3) _____

(2) Kevin S. Lemark. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 09 March 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 7 and 8.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: During the telephonic interview on 3/9/2007, Applicant's representative Mr. Kevin S. Lemark confirmed with the Examiner's request that claim 8 was further elected for initial search purpose, and admitted that all subject matters in claim 8 are within one invention, and they are obvious among the subject matters. A prior art that anticipates and/or renders obviousness over any one species in claim 8, will anticipate and or/renders obviousness over entire sub-genus of claim 8.